



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

duced, he argued, Parliament could increase its expenditure on constructive projects without needing to make intolerable demands on the taxpayer's purse. The absence of immense armaments would keep cool the heads of financial and other adventurers; and the race in armaments being arrested, international suspicions, hatreds, intrigues, crises, and wars would automatically pass away. Besides, the practical pacifist maintained that reforms must be gradual, and that, therefore, the only way of putting an end to militarism is by the *gradual* reduction of armaments.

The experiences of the world war have not lessened the enthusiasm for the foregoing proposal. It still appeals powerfully to the mass mind. International lawyers regard it as the only avenue leading to the temple of permanent peace. Moreover, considerable numbers of pacifists, intent on being practical, range themselves with its supporters. Scarcely a document published on the subject of a durable peace but pays homage to this proposal.

Yet enticingly plausible as the method appears to be, it fails to take note of the realities of the situation. Before the world war the inexperienced lay mind might easily have imagined that the armaments of nations could be as readily counted and limited as the toy armaments of a soldier's child. This view has become impossible, I submit, since the outbreak of hostilities. The war has deeply impressed on our minds the fact that modern armaments are in an unstable condition, and therefore unapproachable from the arithmetical standpoint. Who before the war suspected the existence of cannons which would reduce the most formidable fortresses to a dust heap in a few days? Or of long-range guns which are completely immune from counter-attack? Or what layman would have divined the fiendish potentialities of machine guns, particularly in connection with barbed-wire entanglements? Or the swift development of the submarine, aeroplane, and airship? These cannot be manifestly enumerated in an inventory. Nor could we solemnly state that each nation is restricted to so many cannon, machine guns, aeroplanes, or submarines, of such and such a character, when we know that before the limitation treaty is signed novel inventions will have rendered the treaty obsolescent and worthless. Indeed, such a treaty, if it ever came to be framed and accepted, would stimulate inventions beyond anything surmised in the past, and thus largely add to the incalculable element in armaments.

An effective limitation treaty would be therefore bound to stipulate that military inventions must cease or be impartially communicated to all powers, which is transparently absurd. It is as if we commanded the several general staffs to inform all powers of their plans.

And yet if the spirit of invention cannot be banned, the proposal to limit armaments represents an empty dream. Tomorrow a State may invent an engine of war which may double its military strength, and so long as this possibility exists every State will be constrained to arrange that many of its most active minds should devote their energies to perfecting its military instruments and supplementing these by novel ones. Accordingly, suspicions must remain rife, espionage common, distrust of other nations inevitable, and intrigues, crises, and wars recurrent.

The abolition of militarism by the gradual reduction

of armaments, and even the equal mutual limitation of armaments, constitute, therefore, conceptions which are entirely impractical. Facing the facts fairly and squarely, those who are searching for the means of establishing a durable and endurable peace at the conclusion of this war must unreservedly admit that the proposal to limit armaments by mutual consent should be dismissed as visionary.

Armaments or no armaments, that is the question. However, whether it is practical or desirable that armaments should be dispensed with raises a new and momentous problem which I should like to discuss on another occasion.

[Mr. Spiller's second article will appear in the November ADVOCATE OF PEACE.]

## AMERICA, JAPAN, AND CHINA

By BARON EI-ICHI SHIBUSAWA

MY visit to America in 1915 was, as I believe most Americans understand, not the result of any official mission, either on the part of the government or the people of Japan. I came solely as a private citizen and in my individual capacity. The several objects I had in view, all of a private nature, were satisfactorily attained, and I have returned to my own country with an increased sympathy with and understanding of the American people and their remarkable and prosperous land. Acquaintances formed among American business and professional men on the Pacific coast and elsewhere have been delightfully renewed, and in the many conversations that I have had with these representative Americans I have, I trust, been able to make clearer in their minds than ever before the friendly attitude and the spirit of cooperation that is slowly and surely uniting our two nations.

I was a boy of fourteen when, sixty-three years ago, the United States forcibly knocked at our door and awoke us from our dream of centuries. At that time I was at my father's home not far from Tokyo, dividing my time between the field and study of the Chinese classics and fencing. The times were getting exciting, and political agitators used to visit our district now and then. Boy as I was, I was deeply impressed by what they told us of the political situation, particularly of the alleged blunder of the Shogunate government in its foreign policy. I could not help feeling my breast swell with indignation at what I considered an unpardonable act of treason on the part of the Yokugawa officials in opening the country to foreign intercourse. Ten years later I left my father's home and joined the increasing band of political agitators, but a strange irony of fate soon after made me a retainer in the household of the Prince of Hitotsubashi, an immediate branch of the Shogun's family, and I was ordered to go to France for purposes of study. Once in that refined and enlightened country, I was cured of my mistaken antagonism to the progressive policy of my government, and I began to realize the significance of the step Japan had taken by the advice of the United States. It was, indeed, a turning point in the destiny of the nation, and it was fortunate that the power that set our face in the right direction in the nick of time was the trans-

Pacific Republic, traditionally free from territorial aggrandizement and genuinely devoted to the cause of civilization and peaceful commerce.

As I came to study the history of those stirring times in the light of my later experience, I began to realize the real significance of Commodore Perry's mission. I realized that if it had not been for the high character of that officer, and if the country that sent him had not been America, the first treaty that Japan signed with a foreign power would not have been so moderate and so fair to her. I also felt particularly grateful to America's first diplomatic representative, Townsend Harris, for the infinite patience with which he initiated the ministers of the Shogunate government into the novel ways of modern diplomatic intercourse. He was not a mere diplomatic agent representing a foreign government; he was a friendly guide and adviser to the government to which he was accredited. I may refer to an incident during his residence in Yedo that has endeared his memory to all Japanese, and that will endear him to our posterity to the end of time. When his secretary, Heusken, was assassinated in the streets of Yedo by a fanatic, all the other foreign ministers lowered their flags and retired to Yokohama. But Harris, who of all the foreign ministers might have been the first to retire from the capital, refused to follow his colleagues, declaring that he had every confidence in the ability of the Japanese government to protect him. An act of this kind cannot fail to make a lasting impression upon the grateful mind of a Japanese samurai.

The relations of gratitude on the one side and of friendly and helpful interest on the other continued to be of unqualified intimacy until about the year 1905, when the situation began to be somewhat altered by an unfortunate policy of discrimination against Japanese immigrants in California.

This question has always caused me much concern, and the satisfactory solution of it has occupied my thought and attention during the past ten years. The best way of settling an international trouble is for men of both nations to get together and have a frank and honest talk, straight from their hearts. Every opportunity that has come to me to have personal discussions on this matter with Americans I have eagerly seized. I did so very extensively when I visited America seven years ago as chairman of the Honorary Commercial Commission, and even more to this end did I devote my energies in last year's visit. While staying in San Francisco, in November, I presented my views on the so-called Japanese problem in California on several occasions, the most notable of which was at a meeting of the Committee on Japanese Relations, which was formed about the time of my arrival in America.

At this meeting I took pains to make it clear that the only question outstanding between Japan and America was the status of Japanese lawfully admitted into the country. The question of Japanese immigration was no longer under consideration, for that question had been disposed of several years ago by the conclusion of the so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement." The stipulations of that compact are being most rigorously enforced by the Imperial Government, so that no laborer is under any circumstances allowed to leave the country for America. The object of the agreement is thus nothing less

than absolute exclusion of Japanese labor immigration. The Japanese people naturally dislike being denied entrance into America, while all races from Europe are welcomed with open arms. But the honor of the country has been pledged under a solemn agreement, and no patriotic Japanese ever dreams of breaking his plighted word. Even the jingo press does not demand free admission of our labor immigration. So that question has been definitely gotten out of the way, and the only cause of complaint on our part is the discriminatory legislation against Japanese already admitted into the Republic.

I dwell on this point at some length because I have often noticed that attempts are made in California to confuse the real issue by injecting the immigration problem into the controversy, thereby making it appear as though Japan were demanding free admission of her laborers. Such a presentation of the matter is utterly beyond the facts. The Japanese people are not unaware of the difficulties which the American Government feels in handling this delicate question of the status of the Japanese residents of California, and they are genuinely willing to meet the Americans half way in solving it. In this regard it has always been my pleasure as well as my earnest effort to take every opportunity to advise my fellow-nationals in the United States to conform to all American customs and manners, and, in short, to become thoroughly Americanized.

Along this line I value highly the work of this Committee on Japanese Relations, of which I have spoken, and I have myself assumed the responsibility or organizing in my own country a similar committee, to co-operate with your countrymen for the purpose of considering means of making the two nations understand each other better, and to investigate adequately the salient features of our joint problems. It will also be the duty of these two committees to devise ways and means of drawing the two countries into closer unity in all their relations in the East.

One of my most pleasant and profitable experiences in this last visit to America was a series of informal meetings with your labor leaders. Among others, it was my good fortune to meet Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, at a dinner party given by Mr. Kinji Ushijima ("George Shima"), of Berkeley. Besides Mr. Gompers, there was also present Mr. Scharrenberg, a very influential local labor leader. I had very pleasant conversations with Mr. Gompers, whose straightforward and illuminating talk on the labor movement in America, its history, its aims, etc., was very interesting to me. I also tried to acquaint him with my attitude toward labor questions and my heartfelt solicitude for the maintenance of close friendship between the two nations. He seemed to appreciate my endeavors in this respect, and at the close of the dinner he rose without being asked and spoke for fifteen minutes on the subject of the relations between Japan and America. He expressed his earnest hope that the friendship now existing between the two countries would last forever, and otherwise expressed himself in a friendly manner about Japan and her people. Later on in the evening Mr. Gompers again arose and proposed a toast to "friendship between America and Japan."

On my return to the coast I met several of these gentlemen again, and found, as before, that their attitude was open and friendly. On this occasion they stated positively that their sole opposition to the Japanese laborer was an economic one, and that they had no racial prejudice whatever. I recall that Mr. McArthur, San Francisco Port Commissioner and a well-known labor leader, laid special stress on the fact that the injection of the racial problem into the question of Japanese immigration was the work of politicians who were exploiting the whole question for their own purposes. Altogether these meetings were a distinct success, likely, I am confident, to go very far in removing misconceptions in both countries.

The relations of Japan and America in regard to the development of China was a matter of most interesting discussion during my stay in New York, where I had many talks with influential men in the field of finance and business. It is a pleasure to find how many Americans are awakening to the possibilities of investment in foreign fields, and particularly in the East. Your newly-formed American International Corporation, inspired by Mr. Vanderlip, of the National City Bank of New York, is especially promising. Let me give assurance that we Japanese will always sincerely welcome the attention of these gentlemen in the foreign markets, and, above all, in China. We are vitally interested in China, and do not intend to lag behind any other nation in the peaceful exploitation of that country; but our policy is in no sense exclusive. It is only necessary that there be a definite understanding between the Japanese and American financiers and business men, so that hostile competition may be avoided, competition that might well otherwise have most unfortunate consequences upon the relations between Japan and the United States.

Combination and cooperation are by all means to be desired. We are geographically and racially close to the Chinese, with whom we have much in common in matters of culture, history, and literature. We therefore understand the Chinese people better than Americans can ever hope to do. Then, again, thirty years' strenuous endeavors in industrial improvement have provided us with a force of fairly efficient experts, foremen, and skilled laborers. We can manufacture material needed for industrial development. Now all these advantages would be at the disposal of Americans if they would cooperate with us. The practicability of such cooperation has been abundantly demonstrated in Chosen and Japan. In Chosen I am engaged in mining operations with a number of Americans, and our relations are most satisfactory, and the venture is a success. There are also in Japan a few undertakings under joint Japanese and American control, which are equally satisfactory and successful. It is true that the political relations between Japan and China do not happen to be particularly cordial, but I have no doubt that this is only a passing phase, and that China and Japan are bound sooner or later to be on a footing of sincere cordiality. In any case, the Chinese people are very responsive to calls of material interests, so that even now it is very easy to organize joint Chinese and Japanese concerns for business or industrial purposes. I utilized every opportunity in New York to emphasize the necessity of cooperation and friendly understanding between

Japanese and American capitalists in China. I spoke on this subject before a large gathering of influential editors and writers. I discussed it in my interviews with reporters, and I always referred to it in private talks with influential leaders of finance and business. I am glad to say that my views on the matter were for the most part agreed to by those with whom I talked.

The European war has disturbed the political and financial balance of all the nations of the world to greater or less extent. When this devastating and unnatural struggle may end no man may now foresee, but there are even now means that may be taken by the countries not so definitely drawn into the maelstrom to provide for a better condition of international relations with the war's close.

Apart from the question of responsibility for the origin of the war, it is melancholy to think that after all the progress in arts and sciences, and after the incessant preachings of centuries, the old adage that might makes right should still remain in practice the motto of leading nations. It should be the duty of every right-minded man to endeavor in his special field to bring about the restoration of peace and happiness to the much-harassed peoples now under arms. In order to bring about this most desirable result, we must look principally to the people of your great Republic, who are so strongly imbued with the sentiments of justice and humanity; and I am gratified to know that this matter is engaging serious consideration among the leaders of thought and affairs in America. The Japanese, on their part, I am convinced, will be ready to do their share in this noble task in the interest of humanity and in maintaining peace in their part of the world. United, these two nations will be able to do much in preventing the recurrence of such disastrous calamities to humanity in the future. From this point of view, also, we thus see how important it is that there should be friendship and good understanding between Japan and the United States.

## INSURANCE AGAINST WAR

By MAC CORMAC SNOW

**I**N RECENT conversations about preparedness I have more than once been met by the question, "Wouldn't you insure your house against fire?"

Would I insure my house against fire? Would I insure my country against war? The analogy is worthy of elaboration.

There are two ways of insuring a house against fire. The first is to fill it with gunpowder, dynamite, lyddite, melinite, Roman candles, sky-rockets, and gasoline, and then be cautious not to set it off. The second is to select a group of capitalists and pay them a premium for their counter-promise to pay the financial loss if the house burns down.

A majority of sound business men prefer the second method.

There are two ways of insuring a nation against war. The first is to fill it with manufacturers of munitions, military officers, and army and navy leagues, and then hold them back, if possible. The second is to pay a group of capitalists a premium for their promise to stand the money cost of any war that may occur.